

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Thursday, March 28, 2013 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Steve Fewell, Supervisor Steffen, Supervisor Moynihan
Excused: Supervisor Jamir, Supervisor Carpenter
Also Present: Brent Miller, Dave Hjalmsquist, Juliana Ruenzel, Troy Streckenbach, Lynn Vanden Langenberg.

I. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Steve Fewell at 5:17 p.m.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to move Items 17 a & b to follow Item 1a. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of February 28, 2013.

Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Comments from the Public: None

1. Review of minutes:

a) **Housing Authority (February 18, 2013).**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Although shown in the proper format here, Items 17 a & b were taken at this time.

Communications:

2. Communication from Supervisor Steffen re: A budget development policy. Held for one month.

Supervisor Steffen stated this had been created last year and has spent a few months making its way through Committees and to the County Executive. Some adjustments have been made to the original policy. One is based on Supervisor Lund's input in which he thought that this should be not only for budget increases but also for budget reductions. The other change was based on some of the other counties that have similar policies and was for adjusting the notification period from five business days to four business days.

Steffen continued that the core part of this policy is that at budget time he believes it would be helpful if there was a little more transparency and disclosure to the media, the public, staff and colleagues as to what is being proposed from a budgetary standpoint. This would help alleviate the scramble on budget day in which staff is having to quickly put together information that may be incomplete and further that the Board has not had the opportunity to discuss or discern with constituents and the press has not had an opportunity to present it either. Steffen felt this was appropriate as a courtesy and a policy and as part of transparency we should be requesting and requiring that we have supervisors provide their thoughts on budgetary adjustments a minimum of four business days in advance. As a point of reference, Steffen stated the Board spent a full month to review, discuss, develop and distribute a thank you note to Donald Driver. When making multi-million dollar determinations Steffen felt all parties should be provided the opportunity to have four business days to review the same. Steffen continued that this is obviously not something that is out of the ordinary as a number of other counties already have this type of provision.

Fewell stated that typically the budget meeting is held on a Monday or Tuesday, however Moynihan stated that the budget meeting will fall on a Wednesday this year. Fewell stated that if the budget meeting is held on Wednesday, that would provide the two days prior as well as Thursday and Friday of the previous week. He questioned if this would still allow time to have documentation included in the weekly packet without having to have Sheriffs Deputies deliver the packets. Steffen stated this was a good question and he thought that most people would be able to receive information electronically but he is not familiar with the process in the Board Office. Fewell felt that if this was amended to five business days, at least for the upcoming budget session, this would at least get it to the Wednesday preceding the meeting which would probably be the deadline for County Board staff to get documentation included in the packet. Moynihan agreed and stated that that is the reason the budget meeting is slated for Wednesday this year because this should give ample time for changes beforehand. Director of Administration Brent Miller stated that someone could still bring something up at the eleventh hour pursuant to statutes.

Steffen stated that this would be an internal policy and Moynihan stated it would be more of a courtesy issue and he liked the idea. Fewell stated that if an ordinance was created it still would not allow the Board to be more restrictive than statutes permit. Miller stated that it would not be possible to preclude someone from bringing something forward. Moynihan stated that over the years with repetition it may change the mindsets going forward.

Fewell felt it may be more consistent if the policy were to state if it were the Tuesday prior to the budget meeting, although the Tuesday prior to the budget meeting this year would be the day before the meeting. Fewell stated if this was changed to five days' notice it would solve it for this particular budget year and probably for a lot of budget years. Moynihan felt that five days made more sense than four days.

Steffen questioned the procedure on this and Fewell stated that this would go to County Board in resolution form and that all resolutions, whether passed or not, go to County Board. Moynihan further explained that all resolutions are reflected at the Board level.

Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to amend the proposed policy from four business days to five business days. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve as amended and forward to Executive Committee. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Child Support

3. **Budget Status Financial Report for December, 2012.**

See action at Item 4.

4. **Director's Report.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file Items 3 & 4. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Information Services

5. **Budget Status Financial Report for December, 2012.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **Director's Report.**

IS Director David Hjalmquist commented on the last bullet point contained on his report in the agenda packet, and stated that the County is in negotiations with Merit as they have now started to move forward with the Highway 41 fiber optic project. They will be moving down the Highway 41 corridor and they also

have a need to get out to the UWGB Campus so there will also be discussions with Merit as far as connecting East Shore Drive out to UWGB to connect with WiscNet which is Merit's sister in Wisconsin. This will give Brown County the capacity to potentially provide services to other municipalities. Hjalmsquist will bring forward the bids along with information and recommendations at the next Admin meeting.

Hjalmsquist also reported that he found out earlier in the day that the RFP for the Council Chambers at City Hall was approved by the City Finance Committee and will be going in front of the City Council at their next meeting for approval at which point they will begin to move forward with the upgrades to the Chambers. Moynihan asked what the RFP cost was and Hjalmsquist indicated it came in at about \$ 89,000 and of this; the County has set aside \$50,000 for the project. He also noted that there will be several items left to buy such as a projector and a new printer.

Fewell asked if there was anything in the Chambers upgrade RFP that would supply electrical outlets for the supervisors to be able to use laptops at their desks. Hjalmsquist stated that he thought the RFP included electric, but he will look into this further. Fewell stated as it is currently set up supervisors have no ability to plug in electronic devices at their desks.

Fewell also asked if responses have been received with regard to the audio visual project proposed for Room 200 of the Northern Building. Hjalmsquist stated that they had a walk through attended by four vendors and they received one proposal from the RFP process and this vendor is the same vendor that won the bid at City Hall. Moynihan stated that he had spoken with Hjalmsquist on this matter earlier and next month Hjalmsquist will be bringing forward additional information. Moynihan felt it was important to do this while it was still fresh in everyone's mind because he felt the whole ideal was mischaracterized last week and he felt that perhaps when people see it they will have a different outlook.

Steffen brought up an issue the Health Department is having with their phones in that they are not able to receive odor complaints regarding Sanimax as there is an "off" after-hours message. Apparently the system has not adequately worked for the communities as well as the Health Department and Steffen asked Hjalmsquist if some of the upgrades being done to the phone system will address these issues and be available to the Health Department. Hjalmsquist stated he would have to verify that the Health Department is on the phone system, and, if they are, there should be plenty of options with regard to front end messaging and after hours messaging.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Department of Administration

7. Budget Status Financial Report for December, 2012.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Countywide 2012 Financial Statement Results – Unaudited.

Director of Administration Brent Miller stated this ties in with his director's report. He directed the Committee's attention to the report and stated there are a few things that have been highlighted from the report. He continued that the Treasurer has a net loss of \$588,922 and this is due to the fact that the County is losing interest and penalties from people paying their taxes late because now when a bank forecloses they are settling up quicker so they do not have to pay interest and penalties. One other significant thing is that the Register of Deeds processed a significant number of transactions towards the end of the year which resulted in \$182,535 being returned to the general fund. Unfortunately the Clerk of Courts is coming in at \$219,000 over budget and this relates mainly to guardian ad litem fees.

Fewell stated in looking at this report there is a column for the levy amount and a column for the actual need amount. He felt that with accounting principles there should be a certain percentage of leeway in which a budget comes in, whether it's three percent or something similar but if a department is way over or way under, the Board can start asking questions. Fewell continued that Public Safety Communications is

\$209,447 under budget of a \$5 million dollar budget, but in looking at the Medical Examiner's office there is \$175,421 in levy and \$75,324 is what was actually needed and that's \$100,000 that has been over budgeted. Miller stated that with regard to the Medical Examiner there was more revenue that came in that was not budgeted for. This revenue was due to more cremations and there was also some changes in health insurance. Miller stated that there are more people being cremated than there were in the past and this is a statewide trend. Fewell stated he has always questioned the fees as he does not like the fact that the County is making \$100,000 more than anticipated. This says to him that there is a fairly significant death tax that is being put on families. He questioned why we are raising so much money off of death.

Steffen stated that one of the things the government often fails to do is develop a system that is financially sustainable. He asked Miller if he believed the revenue, when taking into account overhead and everything else that is involved with the process, far exceeds all the expenses. Miller asked if he was asking specifically about the Medical Examiner and Steffen stated he was. Miller stated that based on the information, and he noted that this is the unaudited report that has been submitted, it does take into account all those things so based on the numbers right now it includes everything.

Fewell asked Miller if they look at trends as the Medical Examiner's office has consistently returned over \$100,000 annually. Miller did not get into any trends. Fewell continued that budget wise, if they are always returning \$100,000, his inclination would be that the budget should be cut. County Executive Troy Streckenbach stated that they have cut the Medical Examiner's budget. Streckenbach continued that each year the trend was showing an aging population so each year they have lowered their budget. Miller can get specific figures and Fewell stated he would like to see the figures. Moynihan commented that to the Executive's point, if you have an aging demographic, it is all reflected appropriately. Miller stated that in looking at the Clerk of Courts, where they are \$291,000 over budget, there is no way to project that this would have happened from guardian ad litem fees. Streckenbach felt perhaps a deeper look should be taken at this and the Medical Examiner should be asked to better verify this information as it is a rather large return in comparison to the size of the budget.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file Items 8 & 13. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **2013 Budget Adjustment Log.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. **Semi-annual Vehicle Listing Report - request to remove.**

Miller stated that this report lists all of the vehicles the County currently has. He questioned if the Committee still wished to receive this report on a semi-annual basis. Fewell did not feel there was a reason to get this report on a semi-annual basis but he did feel that an annual report would be appropriate. Steffen did not know what information should or could be gleaned from this report. Fewell stated this came about when they were looking and trying to find how many vehicles a certain department had and it was sometimes hard to figure out. This report was generated to show the vehicles each department has so the Board would have an idea of how many vehicles are actually out there.

Streckenbach pointed out that Public Works is actually in charge of fleet management and therefore this report should probably go to PD & T Committee instead of Administration Committee. Streckenbach continued that Public Works turns this over to Admin because ultimately Admin finances and this is a large cost that we are sitting on and he felt that it would be appropriate for Admin to see this report so that when PD & T is getting their report from Public Works this would tie into Admin.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file and instruct Administration to provide an annual report in the month of December. No second. Motion rescinded.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file and refer the report to PD & T for future reports. No second.

Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file and that PD & T refer the fleet management report to Administration Committee for review. Vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. Resolution Supporting Efforts to Maintain the Tax-Exempt Status of Municipal Bonds.

Miller stated this could have a huge impact on the County and could generate \$338 million dollars for the federal government making all bonds taxable, plus the fact that it could have an impact on all the retired people that have mutual funds and bonds and could have a huge impact on the amount of money that they would lose.

Miller noted that when this resolution was drafted he omitted something that he would like to have added and that is that it be forwarded to the US legislators and representatives.

Motion by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to amend the resolution to add the words "and forward to Wisconsin federal delegation" to the end of the resolution. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to approve as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

12. Ordinance creating Section 3.35 of the Brown County Code entitled "Purchasing Ordinance".

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

13. Director's Report.

See action at Item 8 above.

Human Resources

14. Budget Status Financial Report for December, 2012.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

15. Activity Report for February, 2013

Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

16. Director's Report.

Interim HR Director Lynn Vanden Langenberg stated that they have recently had some training with their vendors and later this year or early next year they should be able to implement the E- Suite where employees will be able to log on through the internet and have access to their pay check and make address changes and perform similar functions.

Steffen asked Vanden Langenberg if she had any thoughts or ideas on how to better handle the class issues and reclassification efforts. He gets concerned when the Board goes through each single class and has hour and a half debates on each position. To him it seems that government is taking away control that had been entrusted in her as a high level employee in the County and he is wondering if she has any thoughts or can provide some ideas as to what she could do differently, what the County could do differently, what other counties are doing to possibly address what he considers to be a problematic situation.

Vanden Langenberg stated that they are at a crossroads and indicated that they had 19 different pay scales with the different bargaining units. As positions come open and if it is apparent that they are way outside of the market, to her it seems the most responsible thing to do is take a look at that and introduce a new employee at a rate closer to market, understanding that when we had our wage comparability study done there might be an adjustment there, but otherwise she felt there would be a lot of people that fall outside of the market range. She continued that maybe it is a little bit too much to ask people to understand that this is an interim process until we get the wage comparability process in place but we have to remember that every month if we hire new employees we might be bringing them in outside of market. Maybe more education on how all of this transpired and the situation that we are in right now might help. In defense of the Board, Vanden Langenberg stated she does not know if they have seen the wage scale for all of the contracts. They see dollars in the budget but some of the positions are hired at the top step that might not be where the employees are actually placed on hire, but that is where the budget is. In the case of the housekeepers, for example, there are actually three different bargaining units that they fall into so this is three different wages just for one position.

Vanden Langenberg put together a list of all County employees and the unit they are in for the vendor that will be assisting with the study. If you see those staged out by pay rate, you would see also that there are a lot of inequities.

Streckenbach offered some suggestions and stated that best practice is to look at other counties. Not all counties follow the same scenarios, however, without any doubt the County Board controls wages and benefits and compensation and also the table of organization. The question is how in depth the Board wants to be in control of that. Each year a budget is submitted which includes wages and benefits and you can see from year to year if it is going up or down and the Board can question the administration on that. One way of avoiding this is to say that rather than line item every position, as long as the administration is working within the budget that is given to them and the number of employees has not been increased in the table of organization and this is being properly reported, this is one way for the administration to do that. Streckenbach continued that there are admittedly a lot of arguments against that approach and he felt that some of the more experienced Board members would be able to attribute to those arguments. Streckenbach said that at one time when they intended to pass a budget that did not have all the detail in there, the Board requested that the budget book be redone with all of the line items in it. This is not a question about whether or not the Board has trust in the administration and trust in the items that are presented to each oversight entity in the ability for us to manage the budget that the Board appropriates. This does not necessarily avoid the dispute, because in the end if an employee felt that they were not being properly adjusted for, that does not change them from wanting to and having the ability to come in and express their opinion.

Steffen stated that one of the things it may change is the way it is presented and when it is presented if this is the appropriate Committee to be running these types of HR type items, is if people want to be involved in that discussion this is where they should be. When individual wages are posted they are like bright shiny objects for some on the Board and they become fixated on it. Steffen felt it was a simple thing for them to fixate that the wages should be different. Steffen did agree with Streckenbach in that there is an element of trust but he felt the Board could still provide transparency and checks and balances but if there is a way that it can be compactly put together, he felt this should be done. Steffen was hopeful that some thought could be given as to how to avoid not the transparency and not the control, but the way the time is being spent on the County Board discussing these issues.

Fewell stated that what got him at the last County Board meeting was that it was unusual to have such a debate when the intention was to lower the salary range for a position. The areas that should have huge amounts of debates are when there are significant increases to positions and this has been his concern about a new class and comp study. The Board is looking at positions like the Nursing Home Administrator who is retiring and has a wage of about \$75,000 and stated the County would not be able to hire a new Administrator for that amount. The current administrator is probably underpaid by \$20,000. If a class and comp study comes back and says they should be paying closer to \$90,000 and there is a large increase, that isn't going to fly. We have to do some of this stuff when positions like that are open. This has to be addressed because we are behind in some positions. In some of these positions that are underpaid, there would be no way to get them to where they should be by the time they retire with the County Board

because you could give them an increase of \$5,000 over the next three years until they get up to where they should be, but people would say “you’re giving a \$5,000 increase” and people would be out campaigning on it. This is the catch that Fewell sees with a class and comp study and he feels it is going to be a very difficult thing and he felt we may be better off to reclass these things when we can. He felt it was a bit of an anomaly that the Board was arguing over lowering wages.

Streckenbach stated that the Board has to be prepared to take ownership of the issues created for the last decade. Both Fewell and Moynihan agreed with this. Streckenbach continued that we have some major compression issues in front of us and it will be a very interesting debate because we are going to be in some challenging circumstances in the very near future as to how to address these issues. By the same token, Streckenbach stated that decisions need to be made because there may be individuals within the organization that are compensated very well and a strategy needs to be developed as to how to address that situation as well. Streckenbach continued that we need to have a strategy otherwise we are going to continue to create an employee morale issue. Fewell stated that you cannot keep talented qualified employees without paying them and you also cannot keep morale up for those who are willing to sacrifice and take a lower wage to keep their families here. Streckenbach stated for the employees who are in severe compression issues, he does not know if it as much the wage as it is the recognition in that the County actually has some type of plan. He felt that for a lot of employees, if they were concerned about what they were making, there probably would have been a lot more flight. He felt that employees enjoy living in Brown County because it has a lot to offer and there is a good quality of life here and employees want to stay here. The big challenge of course is that we are able as a community, both the administration and the County Board, to demonstrate to the employees that we have a plan that we are going to exercise. Streckenbach continued that over the last two years everyone’s paycheck has been held or lowered and there has not been a huge flight because of that. Fewell stated that there has been a lot of flight over the last ten years and a lot of people have left, even before Streckenbach was elected as County Executive. Fewell stated that the County Board has not stayed up in paying some of the employees, particularly some of the professionals, what they should be paid. Part of this is the administrative side of it because the union side continued to get increases the entire time. The administration side did not get anything. Administration-wise, Fewell felt there probably were some administrative employees who are higher salary employees that are probably underpaid, while others may be fairly paid and he felt the study will show this. He acknowledged that there are some serious problems in that area and he is willing to take this on, but he knows it is going to be a political upheaval to try to look at a plan that says this is what we have to do to be fair with people.

Streckenbach stated that the good thing is that Human Services Committee talked about this very issue at their meeting this month. Human Services is going into closed session to examine this issue more closely. They recognize the issue and are starting to have the debate on their own level and Streckenbach welcomed each Committee to really start to have this debate. Streckenbach continued that we need to vie behind our employees and he felt we need to come up with a plan that enables him to be able to keep his promise. He is not going to give the Board a budget that is smoke and mirrors. He will give a budget that he can stand behind and hopefully the employees can stand behind. At the same time, there needs to be a strategy in how to address this. This will be a challenge and the administration and the Board will need to work together and collectively.

Fewell stated we are coming out of the period of time when we were working under union contracts and budgeting accordingly and this is what Vanden Langenberg said earlier. There are some employees where under union contract we are budgeting them at \$16.50 or whatever it was, but not all of them are getting this wage. It seems to Fewell that there has to be money somewhere that can help address the compression issue.

Steffen said if the structure of this class and comp study is agreed upon or voted upon by the Board or there is some formula being used that is agreed upon in advance of the numbers and positions being dropped into it people will be a little more held to it. Obviously people are going to come back if the numbers are not favorable to them and say that the numbers are off and appropriate comparables were not used. Maybe if we can get the Board on record as having a majority saying we agree to the comparables that are being used and a good pitch is put on as to why they make sense, this may be helpful.

Streckenbach stated that he asked for three supervisors to sit on this in oversight with the goal that if we can get those three individuals to back the plan, the County Board will respect the work that this commission will do and hopefully downplay some of the debate. Of course this cannot be guaranteed. Unfortunately the study will not be prepared and ready for the next upcoming budget but will be something that will be implemented throughout 2014 and ultimately 2015. Streckenbach stated that the supervisors he has met with have asked what we are going to do to address the issue. Internally administration has been trying to address this issue and ultimately it would be best if individual departments think outside the box and the Board subscribes to new strategies.

Fewell felt there was some wisdom to what Steffen said. You can take three supervisors and put them on a commission and it is not going to get the buy in of the County Board. If you look at the comparables and you bring those comparables to the County Board and the Board agrees upon it as a whole, then there is the fact that when the numbers come back, we are just looking at the raw numbers. Streckenbach stated that he has faith in the overall County Board.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to receive and place on file.
Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

17. Discussion and possible action regarding the proposed settlement offer on the hazardous waste claim at Marine Shale Processors Site.

- a. Closed Session: Discussion with legal counsel regarding strategy with respect to the claim and settlement proposal for the hazardous waste at the Marine Shale Processors Site.
- b. Open Session: Discussion and possible action on the claim and settlement proposal for the hazardous waste at the Marine Shale Processors Site.

It should be noted that no closed session was held.

Corporation Counsel Juliana Ruenzel provided the Committee with documents she received from the DNR verifying that materials were dumped at the Marine Shale site in Louisiana on at least four occasions in 1988, 1989, 1992 and 1993. Based on these records which were obtained from the US Department of Justice, Marine Shale wants the County to pay \$8,000 as a settlement for the County's dumping of dirty materials. Ruenzel does not know what exactly was dumped, but one of the codes indicate it may have been some sort of paint thinner or something similar. Ruenzel continued that Brown County had a small amount of dirty materials that were dumped. This material was sent through a transporter but that does not matter as the law looks at it as strict liability. A release will be provided by Marine Shale upon payment and they should not come back after the County again unless they find other manifest that shows that the County dumped more than five tons.

Ruenzel continued that what happened is the EPA came to Marine Shale and advised them that the site needed to be cleaned up. Marine Shale looked at the manifest and saw who the major players were who were putting hazardous materials into the site. Those major players were 17 parties that formed this group of potential responsible parties. They formed this Marine Shale group and will share the cost of whatever it takes to clean up to the EPA standards. Brown County could be pulled into this and assessed a portion of the cost and this cost would probably be a monthly cost which would cover attorney fees, clean-up costs, testing costs, drilling costs, etc.

Fewell stated that he had spoken with Corporation counsel on this and in the grand scheme of the whole thing, to be able to get out of the liability of this for \$8,000 is appropriate as it would not take very long to accrue that amount in attorney fees alone. Moynihan agreed and Fewell felt that if Marine Shale would let Brown County out for \$8,000 the County should do this. He supports passing this and moving forward.

On another note, Ruenzel stated that sometimes if you go back far enough you can go after your insurance carrier to look to see if there was coverage under a general liability. She has done this, but the policy that was in effect at the time cannot be located, but according to Barb West we were part of the

system we were are currently in and she is in the process of obtaining the policy. West has been advised, however, that as of 1986 they put the pollution exclusion into the contract so if this exclusion does in fact exist the County will be unable to collect on the insurance policy, but Ruenzel will still review the policy when she receives it to double check.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to have Corporation Counsel draft a resolution and signifying the payment of \$8,000 from the general fund therein and forward to the County Board. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

County Clerk – No agenda items.

Treasurer – No agenda items.

18. Audit of bills.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Steffen to pay the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

19. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Supervisor Moynihan recommended that when the full makeup of the Committee is present, due to tardiness and absences, we could look at changing the start time of the meetings. Moynihan brings this up as this is the second time in his term that he has been at this meeting in an ex-officio capacity. Fewell stated that the Committee had already had an informal discussion on this and it will be taken under consideration.

20. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Steffen, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to adjourn at 6:24 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

03/07/2013

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Bureau of Waste Management
Formatted Dump of Facility Information

Page 1 of 2

Facility:

Name: BROWN CNTY FID: 405063780 EPA ID: WID981526767 Site Id: 1149100

Facility Status: Operating Status Change Date:

Operator Type: Private

Loc Address: 325 E WALNUT ST

Mail Address: 325 E WALNUT ST

Loc City: GREEN BAY

Mail City: GREEN BAY

Loc State: WI Loc Zip Code: 54305

Mail State: WI Mail Zip Code: 54305

County: Brown

Region: Northeast Region

Area: Green Bay

Start Date:

Close Date:

Report Medium Type:

Comment: PER AUDIT FORM; NON-GEN PER 97 ANN RPT

Last Update: 07/28/1999

Last User: debroj

Site:

Acre: Hndi Code: 05231

Initial Date:

Site Owner:

Ownership Type:

Loc Address: 325 E WALNUT ST

Loc City: GREEN BAY

PLSS: 1/4 of

Range

Latitude Degree:

Second:

Longitude Degree:

Second:

Activity:

Activity Name

Act. Code	Approved Flag	Original Approval Date	Activity Status	Status Change Date	License Number	License Status	Original License Date	Fee Flag	Closure Plan Closure Date	Actual Closure Date
-----------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	----------------	----------------	-----------------------	----------	---------------------------	---------------------

HW Generator - Very Small

Inactive 02/23/1998

N

Contact:

Act Code: 203

Mail Name: JEFF OUDEANS,

Address: 325 E WALNUT ST

City: GREEN BAY

State: WI

Zip: 54305

Phone: 9204484058

Last Update: 02/23/1998

Last User: OPS\$HAMMEDR

RECEIVED BY
MAR 16 2013

Brown County
Corporation Counsel

RECEIVED
MAR 11 2013
BY

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANIFEST RECORDS FOR SELECTED GENERATOR SHIPPED BETWEEN 01/01/1980 AND 03/03/2013

WIH44425 Shipped: 08/07/1990 PRIMARY COPY TSD DNR Received: 08/17/1990 Batch/Seq: 99800249 / 1581
Received: 08/07/1990 TSD EPA ID: WID000808824 TSD Facility Name: HYDRITE CHEMICAL CO

Transporter EPA ID	Transporter Name	Transporter Date
WID000808824	HYDRITE CHEMICAL CO	08/07/1990

Page No. 1 Line No. 1 Waste Code(s) D001 Amount Shipped/Unit 2500 G Lbs Shipped 20,850
Manifest Lbs. Total 20,850

WIG46893 Shipped: 10/24/1988 PRIMARY COPY TSD DNR Received: 11/09/1988 Batch/Seq: 99809010 / 1227
Received: 11/07/1988 TSD EPA ID: WID044393114 TSD Facility Name: SIEMENS ENERGY INC

Transporter EPA ID	Transporter Name	Transporter Date
WID066888017	AQUA-TECH INC	10/24/1988
WID066888017	AQUA-TECH INC	11/07/1988

Page No. 1 Line No. 1 Waste Code(s) F027 Amount Shipped/Unit 30 G Lbs Shipped 250
Manifest Lbs. Total 250

RR804612 Shipped: 04/27/1988 PRIMARY COPY TSD DNR Received: 06/06/1988 Batch/Seq: 99808347 / 9777
Received: 05/06/1988 TSD EPA ID: LAD981057706 TSD Facility Name: MARINE SHALE PROCESSORS INC

Transporter EPA ID	Transporter Name	Transporter Date
WID066888017	AQUA-TECH INC	04/27/1988
WID066888017	AQUA-TECH INC	05/02/1988

Page No. 1 Line No. 1 Waste Code(s) F005 Amount Shipped/Unit 55 G Lbs Shipped 459
Manifest Lbs. Total 459